

FEB 26 1925

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1925

WHOLE NO. 492



Columbia University

In the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION

July 6 to August 14, 1925



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different Schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

GREEK

Elementary Course (= Entrance Greek a)
Professor Eugene Tavenner

Xenophon (= Entrance Greek b)
Professor Eugene Tavenner

Euripides (College Course)
Professor Clinton W. Keyes

LATIN

Elementary Course (For Beginners)
Mr. Irving C. Demarest

Caesar, Gallic War (= Entrance Latin 3)
Professor Clinton W. Keyes

Vergil, Aeneid (= Entrance Latin 5)
Mr. Irving C. Demarest

Cicero: Intensive Study (= Entrance Latin 4)
Dr. John E. Barss

Cicero: Selected Orations (= Entrance Latin 4)
Dr. John E. Barss

Prose Composition (= Entrance Latin 6)
Dr. John E. Barss

Prose Composition (For Teachers)
Professor Hubert M. Potat

Livy (College Course)
Professor Frank H. Cowles

The Odes of Horace (College Course)
Professor William S. Messer

Prose Composition (For the A.M. degree)
Professor Charles Knapp

Vergil, Aeneid (Advanced Course)
Professor Charles Knapp

Roman Comedy: Plautus and Terence
Professor William S. Messer

Cicero's Letters Professor Hubert M. Potat

The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil
Professor Frank H. Cowles

Teaching Latin in Secondary Schools
Miss Frances E. Sabin

Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin
Miss Frances E. Sabin

ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient History (General Course)
Political and Cultural History of Greece
Professor William L. Westermann

Mr. Thomas P. Peardon
Mediterranean World under Roman Control
Professor William L. Westermann

PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of Summer Session of 1925, Address the
Secretary of Columbia University, New York City

Reading Recommended in the
Report of the Classical Investigation
by the American Classical League

For Historical-Cultural Objectives

Second Semester—Gallup's Latin Reader (fables, short stories, and tales of early Rome, with pictures). 42 pages text. Price \$.60

Third Semester—Arrowsmith and Knapp's Lhomond's Viri Romae (Roman history). 111 pages text. Price \$1.12

Gallup's Latin Reader. Price \$.60

Nutting's First Latin Reader (Stories from early American history, stories retold from Caesar). 157 pages text. Price \$1.20

For Collateral Reading in English

(To precede the reading of Caesar)

Whitehead's The Standard Bearer (story of Roman army life in the time of Caesar, which supplies historical background and gives understanding of text of Caesar). Price \$.72

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

Good Teamwork and Good Results with

COLLAR - DANIELL - JENKINS

FIRST YEAR LATIN (Rev.)

and

D'OOGHE AND EASTMAN

CAESAR IN GAUL

Ginn and Company, 70 Fifth Ave., New York

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1925

WHOLE No. 492

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ON THE DECADENCE OF VARIOUS PEOPLES, INCLUDING THE ROMANS

On March 5, 1908, Theodore Roosevelt, then President of the United States, wrote to the Honorable A. J. Balfour, to thank him for a copy of his book, *Decadence*. For the letter, see the work entitled Theodore Roosevelt and his Times, Shown in his Own Letters, by Joseph Bucklin Bishop (2 volumes, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920). The passage occurs in 2.104-110. I have been especially interested in so much of the letter as had to do with Rome. It was brought to my mind by a passage in a review which Professor Clinton W. Keyes published in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.191-192, of the book of Professor Herbert S. Hadley, *Rome and the World Today*:

Among the many suggested causes for the fall of Rome, Professor Hadley is inclined to emphasize the great plague of the age of the Antonines, and the effort to establish morality, a caste system, stable prices, and indeed uniformity in almost every department of life, by means of legislation. But he recognizes the uncertainty of all the theories on the subject in these words of wisdom (339): "After all our explanations, after giving due consideration to all the causes of disintegration and decline, there is something of mystery that baffles comprehension when the spirit, determination, and capacity for achievement that have characterized a great people vanish from their lives".

President Roosevelt's utterance was made fourteen years before Professor Hadley published his book. It was the utterance, too, of a man who was dealing with what was a *parergon*, an *avocatio*, something wholly incidental in the scheme of his crowded life, a life so crowded that the life of the busiest professional classical scholar seems complete *otium*, in all the senses of that word.

President Roosevelt's letter ran as follows:

White House,
March 5, 1908.

My Dear Mr. Balfour:

Through Arthur Lee I have just received the copy of "Decadence", and thank you for it. I confess I began to read it with some apprehension lest it might have something to do with some phase of French literary thought. Naturally, therefore, I was glad when the first few lines showed that my fears were groundless.

It seems to me that you are eminently right in seeing that it is good to give a name to something of vital consequence, even though in a sense the name only expresses our ignorance. It is a curious thing in mankind, but undoubtedly true, that if we do not give such a name to our ignorance, most of us gradually feel that there is nothing to be ignorant about. Most emphatically there is such a thing as "decadence" of a nation, a race, a type; and it is no less true that we cannot give any adequate explanation of the phenomenon. Of course there are many partial explanations, and in some cases, as with the decay of the Mongol or Turkish monarchies,

the sum of these partial explanations may represent the whole. But there are other cases, notably, of course, that of Rome in the ancient world, and, as I believe, that of Spain in the modern world, on a much smaller scale, where the sum of all the explanations is that they do not wholly explain. Something seems to have gone out of the people or the peoples affected, and what it is no one can say. In the case of Rome, one can say that the stocks were completely changed, though I do not believe that this in the least represents even the major part of the truth. But in the case of Spain, the people remain the same. The expulsion of Moor and heretic, the loss of the anarchistic and much misused individual liberties of the provincial towns, the economic and social changes wrought by the inflow of American gold—all of them put together do not explain the military decadence of the Spaniard; do not explain why he grew so rigid that, at first on sea and then on land, he could not adapt himself to new tactics, and above all, what subtle transformation it was that came over the fighting edge of the soldiers themselves. For nearly a century and a half following the beginning of Gonsalvo's campaigns, the Spanish infantry showed itself superior in sheer fighting ability to any other infantry of Europe. Toward the end of the sixteenth century, neither the Hollanders, fighting with despair for their own firesides, nor the Scotch and English volunteers, actuated by love of fighting and zeal for their faith, were able on anything like equal terms to hold their own against the Spanish armies, who walked at will to and fro through the Netherlands, save where strong city walls or burst dykes held them at bay. Yet the Hollander, the Englishman and the Scotchman were trained soldiers, and they were spurred by every hope and feeling which we ordinarily accept as making men formidable in fight. A century passed; and these same Spaniards had become contemptible creatures in war compared with the Dutch and Scotch, the English and French, whom they had once surpassed. Many partial explanations can be given for the change, but none that wholly or mainly explains it.

What is true of military prowess is even more true of national life as a whole. I do not see how any thinking man can fail to feel now and then ugly doubts as to what may befall our modern civilization—the civilization of the white races, who have spread their influence over the entire world—and the culture they have inherited or acquired in extreme western Asia and in Europe during the last three or four thousand years. There are unpleasant analogies between the twentieth century and Hellenistic antiquity in the first period of the past Alexandrian monarchies; and of course the resemblance is even closer with the orderly, peace-loving, cultivated Roman world from Trajan to Marcus Aurelius. The resemblances are in the way of analogy rather than homology, it is true, and there are deep fundamental differences. But the resemblances are there. Why the creative literary spirit should practically have vanished from Roman lands after . . . Trajan, we do not know. We can see better why the citizens lost the traits which make good individual soldiers; but we can not see why the very time of the astounding urban growth of North Africa, Gaul and Spain should have been coincident with the growth of utter inability to organize on a sufficiently large scale either in peace or war, until everything grew to depend upon the ability

of one or two men on top. Much of the fall of the Roman Republic we can account for. For one thing, I do not think historians have ever laid sufficient emphasis on the fact that the widening of the franchise in Italy and the provinces meant so little from the governmental standpoint because citizens could only vote in one city, Rome; I should hate at this day to see the United States governed by votes cast in the city of New York, even though Texas, Oregon and Maine could in theory send their people thither to vote if they chose. But the reasons for the change in military and governmental ability under the empire between, say, the days of Hadrian and of Valens are hardly even to be guessed at.

I have always been greatly interested in what you point out as to the inability of the people of that strip of Western Asia which is geographically North Africa ever to recover themselves from the downfall of the Roman Empire. It is a rather irritating delusion—the delusion that somehow or other we are all necessarily going to move forward in the long run no matter what the temporary checks may be. I have a very firm faith in this general forward movement, considering only men of our own race for the past score or two centuries, and I hope and believe that the movement will continue for an indefinite period to come; but no one can be sure; there is certainly nothing inevitable or necessary about the movement. For a thousand years, from the days of Alexander to the days of Mahomet, in spite of fluctuations, the civilization of Asia west of the Euphrates was that of Greeks and of Asiatics profoundly affected by Greek influence. Then it disappeared from the land; just as the extraordinary Roman civilization disappeared from North Africa, and left not a single vestige behind save the ruins of cities and the masonry around the springs that have dried up under the destructive impotence of the rule that succeeded it.

It is hopeful of course to think how peoples do revive now and then; peoples doubtless partly the same in blood as those that fell, and at least with the ancestral inheritance of language, of culture. You have pointed out the greatest instance of this in Italy. A totally different and much smaller example is furnished by modern Switzerland.

The intrusion of an alien race into another civilization, its growth and supremacy and dying away, is of course curiously paralleled by what we see in the animal world, and the parallel is complete in at least one point—that is, in the fact that in such case the causes may be shrouded in absolute darkness. South America, until the middle of the Tertiary period, had a mammalian fauna almost as unique as that of Australia, composed chiefly of small marsupials, and of what we loosely call edentates, also of small size. Then there occurred physical union with the great arctogeal continent by the Isthmus of Panama. There followed an influx of northern fauna and an extraordinarily powerful and abundant faunal life sprang up. The dominant forms were those of the intruders—saber-tooth tigers, bear, deer, elephants, swine, camels, tapirs, horses, all of great abundance in species, and many of the species of giant size. Under the pressure most of the old forms disappeared; but some of the so-called edentates developed into ground sloths and giant armadillos as large as elephants; and some of these forms when thus developed proved not only able to hold their own in South America, but gradually in their turn made their way north across the Isthmus and spread into North America in the teeth of the competition of the descendants of the forms that had anciently overrun South America. Thus there grew up in South America a faunal life as gigantic, as fierce, as varied, as that of Central Africa at this moment, and on the whole more like that of Central Africa than like the life of South America to-day, and infinitely more so than like the old

eoecene life of South America. Then there came a change, we know not why. In North America the glacial period may have had much to do with it, but surely this can not have been true of South America; yet all of these huge formidable creatures died out, alike the monsters of alien type from the North, and the monsters developed from ancient autochthonous types. A few weak representatives were left, of both types; but the old magnificent fauna completely vanished; and why we can not say, any more than we can explain why the Roman so completely failed permanently to leave North Africa to his descendants.

Of course there is a small side trouble, due to our terminology. All species of animals ultimately disappear, some because their kind entirely dies out, and some because the species is transformed into a wholly different species, degenerate or not; but in our nomenclature we make no distinction between the two utterly different kinds of "disappearance". So it is, of course, with nations. I really believe that people sometimes think of "new" nations as being suddenly created out of nothing; they certainly speak as if they were not aware that the newest and the oldest nations and races must of course have identically the same length of racial pedigree. They talk, moreover, of the "destruction" of the inhabitants of Mexico, and of the "destruction" of the inhabitants of Tasmania, as if the processes were alike. In Tasmania the people were absolutely destroyed; none of their blood is left. But the bulk of the blood of Mexico, and a part of the blood of the governing classes of Mexico (including Diaz), is that of the Mexicans whom Cortez and his successors conquered. In the same way Australia and Canada and the United States are "new" commonwealths only in the sense that Syracuse and Cyrene were new compared with Athens and Corinth.

Every time I read this letter, I am impressed again with the marvellous capacity of the wonderful man who wrote it, not as a professed classical scholar might, as the result of long months of special research, but evidently directly out of the extraordinary breadth and depth of the knowledge which, on so many subjects, he had immediately available.

By way of comparison, a most instructive comparison, too, I append a paragraph from THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.46. This occurs near the end of Professor W. W. Hyde's careful review of Professor Tenney Frank's book, *A History of Rome* (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923). In Professor Hyde's summary of Professor Frank's attempt at an explanation of the decline of Rome, and in his comments on that attempt, we have the views of two good classical scholars, beside which we may set the views of a public man not in any sense a professional classicist. Professor Hyde wrote thus:

In Chapter XXXI Professor Frank discusses The Causes of Rome's Decline, remarking that we must admit that "a definite and adequate answer will never be available" (565). Among the chief causes he names three—the rapid expansion of Rome, the existence of slavery on a vast scale, and, as a consequence of these, the displacement of Romans by non-Romans. His attempt to gauge aright the economic factor seems inadequate to one who has read W. L. Westermann's article, *The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture* (*American Historical Review* 20 [1915], 723-743). One may also feel that in this chapter (463 f.), and elsewhere in the book (e. g. 179, 242-243), too much emphasis is laid on the racial changes and the gradual uprooting of the Roman and Italian peoples who were constantly being "replaced by newer stocks

from below", i. e. slaves. That . . . the race which built the Republic was destroyed by peoples temperamentally incapable of Roman government (243) is not so clear in the face of similar conditions in America. Dr. Frank might have followed more closely his own words: "We know as yet so little about race and racial inheritance that extreme caution is necessary in attempting to estimate this factor" (566). The few lines devoted to the part played by Christianity in the general ruin of Rome should have been influenced by Ferrero's last work, *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity* (1921).

In conclusion, I would call attention to the dissertation by Dr. Marion Edwards Park, now President of Bryn Mawr College, entitled *The Plebs in Cicero's Day. A Study of Their Provenance and of their Employment*. In this dissertation, which was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.211-213 by Professor Theodore A. Miller, Dr. Parks discussed at length the far-reaching changes that, in the last two hundred years of the Roman Republic, took place in the racial composition of the *plebs*.

In the Latin Department News Letter, University of Pittsburgh, edited by Professor Evan T. Sage, there appeared under date of May 1, 1924, matter that is pertinent here.

Roman history has been freely appealed to in the discussion now going on relative to immigration. Thus, in *The Saturday Evening Post*, February 23, 1924, Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania, is represented as arguing that "the principal reason for Rome's collapse was her importation of vast numbers of slaves to do the manual work". As the descendants of these slaves became free and acquired the franchise, "they hadn't the faintest conception of the manner in which a democratic government should function. In return for a small hand-out they would gladly vote for anything or anybody under the sun". More concretely, Mr. Kenneth L. Roberts, writing in the same periodical, February 2, 1924, refers to Professor Frank's studies of the composition of the Roman population in the reigns of Augustus and Hadrian. "A census of Rome's graveyards shows that at the end of Hadrian's reign, 150 years after the beginning of the reign of Augustus, Rome was inhabited by 10 percent Roman stock and 90 percent alien stock". Mr. Roberts accepts the conclusion that one cause—perhaps a sufficient cause by itself—of the fall of Rome was the change in the composition of the people.

CHARLES KNAPP

A CLAUSE IN CAESAR, DE BELLO GALLICO

1.38.5

In Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 1.38.3-5, we find the following passage relating to the town of Vesontio (Besançon):

Namque omnium rerum quae ad bellum usui erant summa erat in eo oppido facultas, idque natura loci sic muniebatur ut magnam ad ducendum bellum daret facultatem, propterea quod flumen Dubis ut circino circumductum paene totum oppidum cingit; reliquum spatium, quod est non amplius pedum sescentorum¹, qua flumen intermittit, mons continet magna altitudine, ita ut radices montis ex utraque parte ripae fluminis contingant.

The present paper is concerned with the clause *ita ut. . . contingant*.

¹So the MSS. Many editors accept a conjecture of Napoleon III: *mille sescentorum*.

In Lewis and Short (*Harpers' Latin Dictionary*), under I. *contingo*, I, B, 3, we read: "With *dat.*: ut radices montis ex utraque parte ripae fluminis contingant, Caes. B. G. 1, 38". Yet Lewis and Short elsewhere say that neither *tango* nor any of its other compounds in its native sense takes the dative. *Attingo* is "constr. with the *acc.*; poet. with *ad*". *Obtingo*, when it means 'touch', 'strike', is active. With the dative it means 'fall to one's lot', 'happen', 'befall', 'occur', just as *contingo*, II, 2, b, "with and without *dat.* of person" means 'happen to one', 'befall', etc. With not a single precedent or parallel to rely upon, Lewis and Short are bold indeed in the assertion that in a solitary instance *contingo* governs a dative! How much simpler is the view, uniformly, so far as I know, adopted by more recent editors, that *montis* is the accusative, and *ripae* the nominative!

Yet, is it not strange that older editors did not see this simple explanation? The editions and the translations accessible to me reveal an interesting variety of interpretations. In 1805 John Mair's English translation of Caesar's Commentaries was published in a revised edition by James Ross, Professor of the Latin and Greek languages in Franklin College. In this, our sentence reads thus: "and that in such manner that the banks of the river reach the roots of the mountain on both sides". But the Rev. J. A. Spencer, whose edition was published in 1859 (New York and Cincinnati), annotated thus (page 198): "*contingant*, scil. *ripam*. Others take *ripae* as the nom. pl. and *radices* as the accus. By the construction here adopted *ripae* is the gen. sing., governed by *parte*". Charles Anthon, page 261 (New York, 1860) writes:

contingant, 'touch it', i. e. the bank. Supply *eam*, scil. *ripam*. Achaintre takes *ripae* for the nominative plural, agreeing <*sic!*> with *contingant*, and makes *radices* the accusative plural governed by this verb. Our construction, which is the received one, is far preferable. By it *ripae* becomes the genitive and *radices* the nominative.

J. J. Oberlin, page 29 (London, 1825), refers to this possibility and quotes M<orus> as authority for it: "*Contingant*, sc. *ripam* M.", but adds, "non ita, potius *ripae* in nominativo heic positum videtur". George Long, in his edition, page 80 (London, 1880), also makes *radices* the accusative, as is proved by his note on the variant reading which inserts *eius* before *montis*: "There is some weight in Schneider's remark that, as *radices* is the accusative, it should not be separated from *contingant* by more words than are necessary".

A few manuscripts omit the word *ripae*, a reading which Clark, quoted by Oudendorp, page 97 (Stuttgart, 1822), finds not intolerable: "Neque enim minus Latine dicitur radices montis ex utraque parte fluminis contingere—nimirum contingere flumen ex utraque parte—quam *ripae fluminis contingere ex utraque parte radices montis*". The note indicates that Clark also took *ripae* as nominative, and Oudendorp finds the omission of *ripae* a "durior ellipsis quam quae perspicuitati Caesaris convenire possit; praeter quod non elegans sit locutio, contingere flumen ex utraque parte fluminis".

From these notes we see that three constructions have been suggested for *ripae*: nominative plural, genitive singular, and dative singular. The last has the approval only of Lewis and Short, and, apparently, of the Lexicon of Hedericus (1739), column 1218: "*contingo*, berühren, *ripae fluminis*, das Ufer des Flusses, *Plin.*" Here *Plin.* seems to be a slip for *Caes.*²

Interestingly, however, translators seem to prefer the interpretation of the lexicographers to that of the editors³. In the translation of the *De Bello Gallico* that forms part of Harpers' Classical Library, a reprint of the Bohn translation, we read: "in such manner that the roots of the mountains extend to the river's bank on either side". H. J. Edwards (Loeb Classical Library) renders by "so placed that its foundations touch the river-bank on either side". They agree with the Greek paraphrast whose translation is quoted in Clark's note: 'The roots of the mountain come down on either side into the river'.

The interpretation which demands the insertion of *eam(ripam)*, though a received one in an earlier day, seems cumbersome. The choice, then, lies between taking *ripae* as dative singular, the lexicographers' view, and taking *ripae* as nominative plural, the grammarians' view. The lexicographer reads a language and reports what he finds in it; the grammarian is inclined to seek uniformity in language. The lexicographer may record an unparalleled construction which the grammarian is tempted to explain away. The translator, when not in the chains of grammar, is naturally on the side of the lexicographer, as is illustrated above. The lexicographer reads a language as if it were living; the grammarian looks to that part of it which is dead. The translator, if he is skilful, reads the language with increasing indifference to rules of grammar as his familiarity with the language grows. While the grammarian looks first of all to clear grammatical analysis, the translator is influenced by many things, of a number of which he may be entirely unconscious.

In our sentence in Caesar, the grammarian finds it difficult to assert that *ripae* is nominative plural; the translator, putting himself in the place of the original reader, reads *radices* as nominative plural, and sees no reason for changing his mind about it to the end of the sentence. Only the recollection that *contingo* nowhere else, in extant Latin, takes the dative suggests that *ripae* may be the subject. Even then,

²H. Meusel, *Lexicon Caesarianum* (W. Weber, Berlin, 1887), under *contingo*, takes the verb in our passage as transitive, that is, he makes *radices* object, *ripae* subject. Mr. T. Rice Holmes, the English lawyer-classicist who has devoted so much time to Caesar, in his annotated edition of the *De Bello Gallico* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.37-39), makes no comment on our passage. In his great work, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (Oxford University Press, 1911; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.30-31), he has only this to say of Vesontio (60): "Vesontio, which now became Caesar's base, was an ideal Gallic stronghold. The town stood on a sloping peninsula, round which the Doubs swept in a curve that nearly formed a circle; while the isthmus, little more than five hundred yards wide, rose from either bank into a steep and lofty hill, girt by a wall, which gave it the strength of a citadel, and connected it with the town". Brief as this account is, it shows that he took *radices* as object, *ripae* as subject, and gives to me a simple explanation of Caesar's meaning. In his translation (Macmillan, 1908), Mr. Holmes renders as follows: "The remaining space, not more than sixteen hundred feet, where the river left a gap, was occupied by a hill of great elevation, the banks of the river on either side touching the base of the hill". C. K.

³But see note 2. C. K.

since *ripae* stands after *ex utraque parte*, it is far more natural to take it as genitive than as a misplaced subject. Were there any question of an emphasis which might require an inversion, in position, of subject and object, the reader might be on his guard. But there is no rhetorical need in this clause for such inversion⁴. If there were, the more natural reading of the sentence would contrast *radices* and *ripae* still more by inverting the order of the parts of the subject also, *fluminis ripae*, which would leave the nominative unquestionable. Then, however, *fluminis* would seem to belong to *parte*, not to *ripae*, and the parallel between *radices montis* and *ripae fluminis* would be lost.

That *radices montis* is, by reason of its position, naturally taken as the subject is shown not only by the English translators, but also by the Greek paraphrast, and by the editors who insert *eam* or *ripam* as object of *contingant*.

But there is another difficulty. The phrase *ex utraque parte* is read naturally with *radices montis*, not with *ripae fluminis*⁵. Proof is, of course, impossible where there is a question of linguistic feeling rather than of inductive rules. But here also inductive reasoning may play its part. The phrase *ex utraque parte* occurs again in Caesar, e. g. 2.8.12. . . *atque ex utraque parte lateris deiectus habebat*. . . , which means 'on both sides of the hill'. If in 1.38.5 the phrase *ex utraque parte* were intended purely as an adverbial phrase, we should expect to find the following order, *ita ut radices montis ripae fluminis ex utraque parte contingant*, or, better still, *ita ut ripae fluminis ex utraque parte radices montis contingant*. Such a combination as *ex utraque parte ripae fluminis*, with *ripae* taken as a genitive singular, means nothing, so far as I can see. Were *ripae* omitted, the sense would be clear, as a stream has two sides, but the bank of a river cannot be thought of as having two sides which are touched by the roots of a mountain⁶. Were the phrase to read *in utraque parte*,

⁴I think I do see, without strain, a rhetorical reason, if not need, for the inverted order (I take *ripae* as the subject).

⁵If one were looking at the site of Vesontio itself, rather than at words descriptive of it, the *mons*, or the *radices montis*, would make a greater appeal to his eye than would the *flumen*, especially if he were approaching on level ground, or even up a slope. I suspect that Caesar started to write *ut radices montis ex utraque parte ripam contingant*, but that, before he finished, he consciously or unconsciously recast his words in a less poetic form. That Caesar wrote his *De Bello Gallico* in haste, without much pains, is a view that has been pressed sometimes with vigor. I do not accept it. That Caesar knew—and practised—in the *De Bello Gallico*, when he was so minded, the devices of rhetoric may be seen e. g. from my discussion of *De Bello Gallico* 6.30.4, in *Classical Philology* 2.465-466.

⁶I believe that *montis* is to be taken twice, once with *radices*, once with *ex utraque parte*. This is an additional reason for the word-order. In reading the passage aloud I should group the words thus: *ita ut radices montis ex utraque parte* <pause> *ripae fluminis contingant*. C. K.

Julian, in a letter to the philosopher Maximus, writes as follows about Vesontio (see The Works of the Emperor Julian, in the translation by Mrs. Wilmer Cave Wright, The Loeb Classical Library, 3.23): "Then I approached Besontio. It is a little town that has lately been restored, but in ancient times it was a large city adorned with costly temples, and was fortified by a strong wall and further by the nature of the place; for it is encircled by the river Doubs. It rises up like a rocky cliff in the sea, inaccessible. I might almost say, to the very birds, except in those places where the river as it flows round it throws out what one may call beaches, that lie in front of it". May *ripae* correspond to Julian's *αἰγιαδοί*, and be translated by 'beaches' rather than by 'banks'? If this is possible, have we here another justification for the inversion of the word-order? W. A. L.

⁷See note 4. C. K.

⁸Why not, if, as here, the mountain lies within the encircling river? Again it is worth while (see note 4), to think of the actual town rather than of the mere words descriptive of it. C. K.

we might render by 'in both portions of the river bank', the upper and the lower. Compare the phrase *in altera parte fluminis*, B. G. 2.5.6. But *ex utraque parte* means 'on both sides'.

There is a temptation to read *ita ut radices montis ex utraque parte ripam fluminis contingant*, which would make excellent sense, and break no rules of grammar.

But the editors read *ripae*, and we must take the clause as it stands. If we take *ripae* as nominative plural, we invert the sentence in such a way that it is doubtful whether any Roman reading it rapidly as Caesar wrote it would follow the construction. A carping critic might even accuse Caesar of an inaccuracy. As the river flows about the town and on both sides touches the mountain which it encircles, it is impossible for both banks to touch the roots of the mountain. Caesar should have used the singular, not the plural. Perhaps it would be difficult to make answer to the criticism. It is worth while to examine Caesar's use of the singular and the plural of *ripa*. Compare 1.53.3 Ariovistus, qui, naviculam deligatam ad ripam nactus, ea profugit; 1.54.4 Suebi, qui ad ripas Rheni venerant; 2.5.5 quae res latus unum castrorum ripis fluminis muniebat; 2.23.2 in ipsis fluminis ripis proeliabantur; 2.27.5 ascendere altissimas ripas; 4.4.2 ad utramque ripam fluminis agros. . . habebant. It will be seen that different parts of the same bank are spoken of in the plural, and the two parts which touch the mountain might be readily spoken of as *ripae*, just as in the phrase *ascendere altissimas ripas* not the opposite banks, but portions of the same bank are meant. Caesar's usage makes a careful distinction; but it is not that between right bank and left bank, but that between the bank at one place and the bank stretched out so as to present various features or to be occupied by various groups of men. Ariovistus found a boat *deligatam ad ripam*, the Suebi came *ad ripas*.

But this distinction does not necessitate the use of the plural here. To touch the bank of the river is a perfectly possible phrase, since in this connection the bank may be thought of as continuous as well as not, as in the expression *ad utramque ripam fluminis agros habebant*, where the banks are considered as continuous, not as broken into portions. In the general statement of the fact that the river and the mountain touch, however, the use of the singular seems to me somewhat more appropriate than that of the plural. Again, a change in the order of the words would alter the effect. If we could read, *ita ut ex utraque parte ripae fluminis montis radices contingant*, the plural would seem quite proper, because the adverbial phrase would distribute the bank into the portions that touch the mountain. This is not impossible with the present word-order, but seems less natural.

The whole difficulty resolves itself into a single question: Is there any reason why Caesar should have written a sentence which his Greek paraphrast and some of his modern English translators find unnaturally inverted? As no reason can be found, two hypotheses suggest themselves: either the text is corrupt, and we

ought to read *ripam*, or *ripas*, not *ripae*, or Caesar has used *contingo* with a dative. To me the grammatically clear construction, which makes *ripae* the nominative plural, seems to demand more courage from a linguistic standpoint to maintain it than the assumption that *contingo* is followed by a dative.

One is tempted to suggest an emendation which would make the sentence more attractive, even at the cost of introducing a new word into Caesar's vocabulary. We might substitute *aquae* for *ripae*, and take *contingant* from 2. *contingo*, 'moisten': 'so that the roots of the mountain are on either side washed by the waters of the river'.

With the accepted reading, Caesar seems to mean, if I understand him, that the roots of the mountain form the bank of the river, or, as the Greek paraphrast has it, the roots of the mountain extend into the river. I doubt if *ripa* is anywhere used merely of the line of meeting between water and land, and, if it were, it would be difficult to see the force of the statement that this line touches the foot of a mountain.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

W. A. LAMBERT

REVIEW

Ἀντίδωρον. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70 Lebensjahres am 11 Dezember 1923, Gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden, und Kollegen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (1923). Pp. viii + 364.

The essays here published in honor of Wackernagel's seventieth birthday reflect by their titles the somewhat unusual catholicity of the studies to which his long career has been devoted. Here are represented not only Greek and Sanskrit, subjects in connection with which Wackernagel's name is particularly well known, but also Latin, German, Lithuanian, Iranian, and, as a matter of course, comparative grammar. Instead of attempting to summarize all the forty papers in the volume, I shall restrict myself to a few which seem particularly important and not too far removed from the classical field.

E. Bethe (Apollo der Hellene, pages 14-21) argues against the theory of Wilamowitz and Nilsson that the worship of Apollo was brought to Greece from Asia Minor. The only significant evidence adduced by these two scholars is, Bethe thinks, the fact that Apollo was preceded by other deities at Delphi and in many other places and cults of continental Greece. The introduction of the worship of Apollo, however, was far earlier than any probable influence of Asia Minor upon the Greek peninsula, and consequently it is more likely, according to Bethe, that Apollo was a god of the Hellenic invaders. But quite possibly it may yet appear that Apollo was in Greece before the coming of the Hellenes. His worship evidently spread in comparatively late prehistoric times, but that does not settle the question. Athene was not the earliest dweller on the Acropolis; but neither was she an immigrant from Asia or from Northern Europe.

To the same sphere belongs M. P. Nilsson's demonstration (*Der Mykenische Ursprung der Griechischen Mythologie*, 137-142) that the chief sites of Mycenaean civilization are also the localities most prominent in Greek mythology, and that in general wealth of archaeological remains and wealth of mythic lore are proportionate. He concludes that the mythology existed in Mycenaean times. Nilsson thinks this involves the assumption that the Hellenic invasion preceded the Mycenaean civilization, so that Greek was the language spoken in that period. "Sonst würde man mehr vorgriechische und nicht ganz überwiegend griechische Namen in der Mythologie erwarten".

The source both of the cult of Apollo and of the mythology is likely to be definitely proven by our increasing knowledge of the pre-Greek languages of the Aegean basin. Even without an understanding of the Minoan inscriptions and with very little understanding of the inscriptions in various languages of Asia Minor, we are slowly coming to a fuller appreciation of the Aegean element in Greek, and particularly in Greek place names and mythological names. It is safe to say the Nilsson is mistaken in thinking that the nomenclature of the mythology is predominantly Greek. Pick-Bechtel (*Die Griechischen Personennamen*², 368-435) found it convenient to devote a separate chapter to the names of heroes, since these differ considerably from the names of real men and women. For many of them, such as Πηλεΐδης, Πηλεΐδης, Μίνως, no plausible Greek etymology has been urged. Since we know that οἶνος is an Aegean word, heroic names containing that stem are to be classed as pre-Greek. Greek etymologies are usually assumed for Ἀγαμέμνων, Ἀλκμήων, Ἀγαλάνη, etc., but one would search in vain in the Greek world of historical times for similar names. Ἀγαμέμνων must always have meant to Greek hearers 'the mighty withstander'; but for all that it is probably a foreign word assimilated to Greek speech material in the same way as Εὐρώπη, whose original form is suggested by Ὀρωπός.

An even more fruitful source of resemblance between mythological names and Greek words was the habit of translating names (compare American Indian names like Sitting Bull, and the fondness of new citizens of the United States for altering Schmidt or Ferrero to Smith). It is difficult to prove that a given name is a translation as long as the language from which it came is unknown; but here and there the inference is fairly clear. Occasionally a hero has two names only one of which has a Greek etymology; Ἀλέξανδρος appears to be a translation of Πάρις and Ἀστυάναξ of Σκαμάνδριος. A similar inference is justified in case a Greek name is genealogically connected with a non-Greek name, e. g. Μενέλαος, son of Ἀτρεΐδης, grandson of Πηλεΐδης, and Διομήδης, son of Τυδείδης, grandson of Οἰνείδης.

A third essay that touches the prehistoric ethnology of the Near East and has also some connection with Greek etymology is one by F. Stähelin, *Der Name Kanaan* (150-153). The word has no satisfactory Semitic etymology, and is to be regarded as an Aegean

name with the suffix which appears in Ἀθήναι, Μεσσήνη, Μυτιλήνη, Πιρηνή, Πυρηνή, etc. Some other traces of a language of this group in Palestine are pointed out.

A. Debrunner (*Metrische Kürzung bei Homer*, 28-40) is convinced that Homer sometimes shortened vowels for metrical reasons, and he undertakes to establish a few cases of the process. The possessive adjective σκιδεύς is a derivative of σκιδή, and there is no satisfactory analogy for the substitution of the stem vowel of the second declension in such a word. In φοινικεύς, φοινικέσσα we have to assume either shortening of the second syllable or contraction of ο + ε. No satisfactory explanation of the stem-form of the oblique cases of Ἀτρεΐδης (Ἀτρεΐδης: βασιλῆος) has yet been hit upon. Debrunner finds good reason for thinking that the shortening took place in the patronymic, and was due to the fact that *Ἀτρηίδης was impossible in heroic verse.

E. Schwartz (*Homerica*, 62-71) advances some ingenious and attractive conjectural emendations of the text of the Iliad. In the last three pages of his article he propounds a new rule about caesura and hiatus. If the Greek and Roman poets had really labored under the burden of all the rules that have been 'discovered' in the last century and a half, they would have had no energy left for the things that other poets consider. It should have been seen long ago that most of the supposed metrical rules must have been mere involuntary results of the nature of the Greek and Latin languages. Fortunately Schwartz's new rule has so many exceptions that they cannot be removed by emendation.

P. Kretschmer (*Beiträge zur Griechischen Lautlehre aus Vaseninschriften*, 190-196) continues a task with which his name is familiarly connected. The most interesting item in the paper is the report that a third century vase contains a Homeric verse in which εἶπε is written Ε/ΕΙΠΕ. A careful examination of the possible explanations of the diagonal line suggests that it may be an imperfectly formed digamma. If so, the maker of the vase had before him a text of Homer which employed that character.

H. Fränkel (*Homerische Wörter*, 274-282) discusses several difficult words, of which ἀθέσφατος is one. The familiar translation, 'not to be told even by the gods', is frequently absurd¹. Was the wine which Elpenor drank (*Od.* 11.61) beyond the descriptive powers of the gods in point of quality or of quantity? How could the Muses teach Hesiod to sing a song (ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον, *Works and Days* 662) that the gods themselves could not sing? The word is obviously a compound of θέσφατος, 'ordinance', 'limit', 'customary restriction', so that ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον means 'song without limit', 'any song <I please>', and ἀθέσφατος οἶνος is 'more wine than is proper or usual'. Fränkel doubts the commonly assumed etymological connection of θέσφατος with θεός².

¹In A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect, by R. J. Cunliffe (Blackie and Son, London, 1924), the following renderings are given: "not suited to the utterance of a (beneficent) God. . . Of winter nights, endless. . . Unlimited in amount <of grain, food>. . . Excessive in amount <of wine>".

²Mr. Cunliffe accepts this etymology.

C. D. Buck (A Question of Dialect Mixture in the Greek Epigram, 132-136) argues against Kretschmer that peculiarly epic forms were sometimes used by the writers of Greek epigrams even if they were not required by the meter. This thesis, plausible in itself, is supported by cogent examples. Consequently, as Buck maintained in *Classical Philology* 7.351-353, psilosis in a Thessalian epigram (published in *Bulletin Correspondance Hellénique* 35.239) is best explained as a reflection of psilosis in Homer, since the rough breathing was current in Thessalian.

One other treatise in the book which throws light upon the pre-classical period is that by G. Pasquali, *Ἀμπωτίς und die Ältesten Beobachtungen der Gezeiten im Mittelmeer* (326-332). *Ἀμπωτίς*, in view of its form, must be a West Greek word, and its adoption into Ionic in this form proves that it had already gained currency before it came to the attention of Herodotus or his predecessors. The honor of being the first Greeks to observe the tides belongs, then, to some West Greek community. Many of these are ruled out by lack of contact with tide water (in the Mediterranean tides are noticeable only when accentuated by the converging shores of a gulf), and others by lack of traders who could give currency to the word *Ἀμπωτίς*. Corinth, however, lay upon a tidal gulf and from early times was the center of an active commerce.

Several papers bring important conclusions in regard to Latin grammar. W. Schulze (*Zur Bildung des Vokativs im Griechischen und Lateinischen*, 240-254) points out that in Hellenistic Greek the vocative from all nominatives in *-ης* is regularly formed with *-η*, and in a few passages in Latin vocatives like *Achillē* and *Ulixē* are guaranteed by the meter. Consequently we should read *Chremē*, *Lachē*, etc., where the meter permits either a long or a short final vowel, as is usually the case in Terence.

M. Leumann (*Lateinisches Enklitisches -per und Steigendes per-*, 339-343) stresses the equivalence of Greek *μὴνθά περ* and Latin *paulumper*. The same inherited value of the particle is to be seen in such a phrase as *hau per bene* (compare *οὐ περ*), but here the three words were closely connected, and a very slight shift of meaning changed 'really not well' to 'not very well'. Thus *per* became prepositive and intensive. The prefix cannot have any connection, as Walde (*Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*², 574) thinks it has, with the preposition *per* or with Greek *περί* in *περικαλλής*, etc. The second member of the last named word is a noun, and the compound means primarily 'having beauty about one', 'surrounded with beauty'.

One of the few literary studies in the book is a paper by Wackernagel's successor as Professor of Greek in the University of Basel: P. Von der Mühl. In a paper entitled, *Die Nebenparabase im Frieden des Aristophanes und Tibulls Erste Elegie und Horaz* (197-203), Mühl traces a rather striking parallel between Aristophanes and Tibullus to the old Ionic elegy of Mimnermus. The argument is too complicated to be reproduced here, but it seems as cogent as could

be expected in view of the fact that the assumed source is no longer in existence.

G. Jachmann (*Naevius und die Meteller*, 181-189) holds that the famous line,

Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules,

occurred in a comedy by Naevius which was presented in 206 B. C., the year when Q. Caecilius Metellus was consul. The line should be translated, 'By <ill> fate Metelli are being made consuls at Rome'. It is shown that *fatum* often carries this connotation in early Latin, and this sense is here required to give the line point, for the consulship did not fall frequently to the lot of the Metelli until after Naevius's death. The poet may have been criticising Metellus's rather unnecessary expedition against the already defeated and impotent Hannibal. Neither the consul nor his family could have had either motive or opportunity to publish the well-known reply,

Dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae.

This was probably a popular saying which crystalized from many conversations about the unprecedented attack upon a consul by a mere comic poet.

Two of the rather numerous oriental articles treat of late Indian verse-forms which have a striking resemblance to the classical hexameter. E. Leumann (*Zur Indischen und Indogermanischen Metrik*, 78-102) thinks that he can trace the hexameter and certain Aryan measures to a common origin in Indo-European times. His method is quite as unreliable as others that have been applied to this dangerous topic. The origin of the hexameter is as thoroughly unknown to-day as when scholars began to discuss it.

Less pretentious, but far more fruitful, is Jacobi's discussion (*Zur Frage nach der Ursprung des Apabhramsa*, 124-131) of one of these curiously dactylic measures. He makes it seem probable that the *dohā* stanza, in which certain poetry of North West India is composed, is developed from the hexameter. We have explicit Greek testimony (Dio Chrysostom 53.6) that Homer was translated into some Indic language, and the original verse-form may well have been retained by the translator. Such a measure furnishes the only satisfactory starting-point for the development of the *dohā*. It is to be hoped that Jacobi will find occasion to discuss the very similar meters which Leumann mishandles in his article.

The volume closes with a bibliographical index of Wackernagel's publications. It includes 97 books and articles and 39 reviews.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

PROFESSOR C. C. DAVIS ON THE VALUE OF LATIN¹

In a new book called *Junior High School Education* (Yonkers, World Book Company, 1924), Professor C. C. Davis, of the University of Michigan, finds that "Of the various special languages under consideration for the Junior High School, Latin has, by all odds, the

¹This note, by Professor Sage, appeared in the *Latin Department News Letter*, University of Pittsburgh, May 1, 1924. C. K.

best claim to recognition". His reasons are the value of Latin for English and for modern European languages, the fact that Latin is required for entrance to professional schools and for certain certificates and will satisfy College entrance requirements, and that "Whatever values of formal discipline inhere in any language may be found in Latin, and to a greater extent than in most other languages" (167). He believes that "any attempt to transplant the traditional beginning course in Latin into the Junior High School is doomed to failure" (171). This seems to me the sanest remark on this subject in any discussion of the Junior High School Latin courses.

WALTER HINES PAGE AND PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE

In *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, by Burton J. Hendrick (Garden City and New York, Doubleday, Page, and Company, 1922. Pp. x + 436; viii + 437), there are two interesting references to Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, which are well worth preserving in the pages of a classical periodical.

The first occurs in 1.23-28, in the account of the establishment of The Johns Hopkins University, and of Page's career as one of the first twenty Fellows of the new University. Dr. Daniel Coit Gilman, when invited by the Trustees of the proposed University to come from the University of California, of which he was then President, to Baltimore, to launch the new institution, urged that the large endowment which Mr. Johns Hopkins had left for the proposed University should be used,

not for the erection of expensive architecture, but primarily for seeking out, in all parts of the world, the best professorial brains in certain approved branches of learning. In the same spirit he suggested that a similarly selective process be adopted in the choice of students: that only those American boys who had displayed exceptional promise should be admitted and that part of the university funds should be used to pay the expenses of twenty young men who, in undergraduate work at other colleges, stood head and shoulders above their contemporaries. The bringing together of these two sets of brains for graduate study would constitute the new university. . . .

It seems almost a miracle that an inexperienced youth in a little Methodist college in Virginia should have been chosen as one of these first twenty fellows, and it is a sufficient tribute to the impression that Page must have made upon all who met him that he should have won this great academic distinction. He was only twenty-one at the time—the youngest of a group nearly every member of which became distinguished in after life. He won a Fellowship in Greek. This in itself was a great good fortune; even greater was the fact that his new life brought him into immediate contact with a scholar of great genius and loveliness. Someone has said that America has produced four scholars of the very first rank—Agassiz in natural science, Whitney in philology, Willard Gibbs in physics, and Gildersleeve in Greek. It was the last of these who now took Walter Page in charge. . . .

A choice group of five aspiring Grecians, of whom Page was one, periodically gathered around a long pine table in a second-story room of an old dwelling house on Howard Street, with Professor Gildersleeve at the head. The process of teaching was thus the intimate

contact of mind with mind. Here in the course of nearly two years' residence, Page was led by Professor Gildersleeve into the closest communion with the great minds of the ancient world and gained that intimate knowledge of their written word which was the basis of his mental equipment. "Professor Gildersleeve, splendid scholar that he is!" he wrote to a friend in North Carolina. "He makes me grow wonderfully. When I have a chance to enjoy Aeschylus as I have now, I go to work on those immortal pieces with a pleasure that swallows up everything". To the extent that Gildersleeve opened up the literary treasures of the past—and no man had a greater appreciation of his favourite authors than this fine humorist—Page's life was one of unalloyed delight. But there was another side to the picture. This little company of scholars was composed of men who aspired to no ordinary knowledge of Greek; they expected to devote their entire lives to the subject, to edit Greek texts, and to hold Greek chairs at the leading American universities. Such, indeed, has been the career of nearly all the members of the group. The Greek tragedies were therefore read for other things than their stylistic and dramatic values. The sons of Germania then exercised a profound influence on American education; Professor Gildersleeve himself was a graduate of Göttingen, and the necessity of "settling hoti's business" was strong in his seminar. Gildersleeve was a writer of English who developed real style; as a Greek scholar, his fame rests chiefly upon his work in the field of historical syntax. He assumed that his students could read Greek as easily as they could read French, and the really important tasks he set them had to do with the most abstruse fields of philology. For work of this kind Page had little interest and less inclination. . . . He fulminates against the "grammarians" and begins to think that perhaps, after all, a career of erudite scholarship is not the ideal existence. "Learn to look on me as a Greek drudge", he writes, "somewhere pounding into men and boys a faint hint of the beauty of old Greekdom. That's most probably what I shall come to before many years. I am sure that I have mistaken my lifework, if I consider Greek my lifework. In truth at times I am tempted to throw the whole thing away. . . . But without a home feeling in Greek literature no man can lay claim to high culture". So he would keep at it for three or four years and "then leave it as a man's work". Despite these despairing words Page acquired a living knowledge of Greek that was one of his choicest possessions through life.

The second passage I have in mind occurs at 2.298-299:

Perhaps what gave most charm to this human side was the fact that Page was fundamentally such a scholarly man. This was the aspect which especially delighted his English friends. . . . "Your Ambassador has taught us something that we did not know before", an English friend remarked to an American. "That is that a man can be a democrat and a man of culture at the same time". The Greek and Latin authors had been Page's companions from the days when, as the holder of the Greek Fellowship at Johns Hopkins, he had been a favourite pupil of Basil L. Gildersleeve. British statesmen who had been trained at Balliol, in the days when Greek was the indispensable ear-mark of a gentleman, could thus meet their American associate on the most sympathetic terms. Page likewise spoke a brand of idiomatic English which immediately put him in a class by himself. He regarded words as sacred things. He used them, in his writing or in his speech, with the utmost care and discrimination; yet this did not result in a halting or stilted style; he spoke with the utmost ease, going rapidly from thought to thought, choosing invariably the one needful word. . . .

CHARLES KNAPP